

B-3594

#987

AN

A N S W E R

TO THE

P A M P H L E T,

ENTITLED

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST AN UNION, &c. &c.

IN A

L E T T E R

ADDRESSED TO

EDWARD COOKE, Esq.

SECRETARY AT WAR.

BY

PEMBERTON RUDD, Esq.

BARRISTER AT LAW.

—D U B L I N:—

PRINTED FOR J. MILLIKEN, 32, GRAFTON-STREET.

1799.

IRISH 1798 COLLECTION

DA 949

.5

.R8

1799

C.2

---

---

AN  
ANSWER, &c. &c.

---

TO  
EDWARD COOKE, Esq. &c. &c.

---

SIR,

WHEN I address YOU, or ANY man, (to whom I have not the honour to be personally known), my first care is—not to be misunderstood;—my first hope—not to offend.

The question (Union or no Union) is become no novelty to the minds of the Citizens of Dublin, and I should be excuseable, perhaps, in discussing it without preface. Yet, as I make YOUR name the usher of MY sentiments to the public, I hold myself bound to account to you, Sir, why I presume to do so.

I have read a pamphlet, (read it, in MANY places with admiration, and I hope, in ALL with respect and temper) I have read a pamphlet, entitled "Arguments for and against an Union, between Great Britain and Ireland," and I have heard, (universally heard), that you are its author.

IF you are NOT the author of the pamphlet in question, I beg you to consider the few following sheets, merely as a dedication, (nothing more), to a gentleman, who happens, in these times of wars and rumours of wars, to fill a very high and confidential office in the military department of this country, with the assiduity of a man of business, and the manners of a gentleman. IF you ARE the author of that pamphlet, I have no apology to make. I shall treat you, as I hope to be treated myself; read you with severity and criticism; *strive* to answer you with candor, sincerity, and truth. I may dissent from your deductions as a politician—without outraging your feelings as a gentleman. To you, then, Sir, no more—to the public, especially the Dublin-public, who have read your pamphlet.—

"AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM."

You

You set out by saying, and you say truly, that the Union is a question of extent and importance; that it applies warmly to the feelings—I believe indeed you say, “to all the feelings of the human mind;” but, alas! there are some men, who have some feelings, to which argumentative applications were in vain; for, they are “armed so strong in”—(I was going to say “honesty,”) “that they pass by them as the idle winds, which they respect not.” You say, it is a question cannot fail to be universally debated, but you express your fear “that it will not be PROPERLY debated.” I am sorry you should have carried the rules of academic theme-writing into the composition of a political pamphlet; I am sorry you should have elucidated your position, by your personal example! Yet, I confess, you have made a convert of me. I have read your pamphlet, and I agree with you, that the Union is a subject, which MAY not be PROPERLY debated.

But of this—more anon:—

Though I do not completely subscribe to the order, even, in which you have arranged your arguments; yet as I presume to answer you, I hold myself obliged to follow you. I think it my duty

to



to attend you, “*seriatim et literatim*,” through every page and line of a production, likely to interest so deeply every man I value in society. In yourself, I believe, you are entitled to all possible consideration and deference to your opinions—but I go farther than that: I believe, and so do thousands as well as I—that you speak the sentiments, at least, that you hold out the reasonings of men higher in political consequence than yourself: and that we, poor people at the *outside* of the curtain, who are too far removed from the machinery of State Pieces, to see the wires which conduct the Pantomime; can only guess at what passes behind the Scenes, from the now-and-then glimpse of the hand of the Prompter. We *must* argue *from* you to them: What you would venture to say, you or they might hazard to do: it is all one, “*QUI FACIT PER ALIUM, FACIT PER SE.*”

Well then, Sir, You would have a Union? Is it so? But you would “discuss it *fairly*,” and to prove your sincerity, you say you will begin by stating the question in the Abstract; viz. (Page 2) “Two independent States, finding their separate existence mutually inconvenient, propose to form themselves into one State, for their mutual benefit.” I deny your postulatam: I never heard  
 one

one single Englishman repine at his separate existence, deprecate his mutual inconveniences, or pray to unite his fate through life, with such a dower-less termagant Consort as poor Ireland. Nay, I am yet to learn, that even the most insignificant *close* Borough in *this* kingdom has petitioned either his Majesty or the Parliament, to advise—to promote—or to effect an Union. I look in vain for the documents whence you collect your hypothesis: The Quarry must be a plaguy secret one, from which you have hewn this corner-stone of your edifice. Yet you say, “nothing can be devised more fit for sober and philosophic argument.” I think it looks bad in prose, yet it might make neat argument to a Canto of Poetry, for it is pretty fiction.

The light of history is beyond question, singularly useful in shewing us the stumbling blocks which tripped up our forefathers, and pointing to us the way which we ourselves should go. The Author of the Pamphlet before me, has availed himself of every—even the most antique illumination on the subject, and has selected no less than TWO examples to prove that an Irish Union would be a “good thing.” Of these two examples, it is true, that one is a few thousand years posterior

to

to the other. It is in the Pamphlet however, (page 3.) put first, and so I take it—I mean the example of the Seven United Provinces, which were (to use the Author's own words) “cruelly oppressed by the Spanish government, &c.” and so “they separated to escape tyranny,” &c.” and the Author says “they did right.” Now, is this an argument for an Irish Union?

But, no doubt, the strong argument is kept for the last—I have dwelt on it with attention, and it runs in these words: “When the Sabines found they  
 “ could not maintain themselves any longer against  
 “ the Romans, and saw that by uniting with them  
 “ they had an opportunity of encreasing their li-  
 “ berty, their happiness, and their power; they acted  
 “ according to the principles of reason and right  
 “ in relinquishing their separate independency as a  
 “ state, *and by their Union, laid the foundation of*  
 “ *Roman Greatness.*” Apply the parallel. Have the Sabines (i. e. the Irish) *found* that they cannot maintain themselves *any longer* against the Romans, (i. e. the English)? Do the Irish see, that by uniting with them, they have an opportunity of encreasing their liberty, their happiness, and (oh! monstrous!) their power? Will even the Author of the Pamphlet answer these questions in the affirmative?



tive? And if he does, still what becomes of his conclusion, viz. “and by that Union, laid the foundation of their greatness.” Of whose greatness? Of Roman, *Roman* greatness. What became even of the very name of Sabine? Was it not lost, merged, overwhelmed and engulfed in the vortex of Roman Rapacity? The Sabines aggrandized the Romans: admitted! Do you want the Irish to aggrandize Great Britain? She don’t need it—She is no adjective state: In the political grammar of Europe, England can stand alone!!! PROUDLY ALONE! and were it otherwise, what Irishman would snatch the staff from the hand of Hibernia, scarce yet able to stand erect, or walk alone; to place it in the grasp of a Sister, older, richer, greater, and stronger; to be hereafter used, perhaps, as the instrument of unmerited infliction,—at best, as the Mace of arrogant superiority. Nay, farther; supposing every possible good consequence, eventually, to arise from it: My mind has an insurmountable antipathy to the old *forcible* reasons which must be the necessary forerunners to assimilate these cases: I should be grieved even to agony, to find the *ravishing* arguments which overcame the Sabines, applied to my fair, my honoured, my

virtuous country-women : and deeply should I fear, that the produce of such an Union would be deserted, or contemned, as a bastard, and instead of being cherished with the milk of human kindness, would be stinted in its nourishment and *suckled by a wolf*. If the Author *will* have Sabine History, why did he forget to hint at the fate of Sabine Tatius ? It might be no inapplicable caution to the Irish promoters of an Union. As the Author proceeds to except especially to every argument drawn from what he calls “ the common-place topics of national dignity and national pride ” — I forbear to touch on them : indeed on that head, there can *not* be TWO opinions, and the question with which he begins, (page 4) is a *petitio principii*.

I deny that the consolidation of the separate shires of the Heptarchy into one empire, nay, even the junction of the kingdom of Scotland to England, can at this day furnish a just and reasonable parallel to an Union between this Country and Great Britain. Independent of the other reasons of popular pre-opinions, (for I will not libel them with the term prejudices) independent of nationality and other arguments to be touched on hereafter,

Nature

Nature herself seems to have interposed local obstacles and impediments to such an undertaking—Nature had not dealt with Scotland as with Ireland—She had not expanded the bosom of the Tweed to the breadth of the Irish Channel, nor dropt the Scottish Hebrides like the verdant plains of Ireland,

“ A PRECIOUS GEM! SET IN THE SILVER SEA.”

SHAKESPEAR'S RICHARD 2<sup>nd</sup>.

The Author proceeds to make just distinctions between questions of choice and of necessity. I pray Heaven! they never may become distinctions without difference.

An Union is compared, (page 5.) to a partnership. But we should not forget that by the very articles of partnership, an eternal relinquishment of our little capital would be a *SINE-QUA-NON*. Our hopes of benefit from this fine participation in an extensive and a wealthy ferme *might* be disappointed, we *might* pine to withdraw ourselves from this great scale of things, and carry on business in an humbler, happier sphere: But where or how is the once-relinquished capital to be subtracted? Alas! the

Independence and the Constitution we have once parted with, is gone and surrendered for ever! And truly should we *never* wish to dissolve the connection, I see no mighty comfort or respectability attached to the situation, at least of the *poor* co-partner." Must he not travel every sitting to the counting-house of his more wealthy ally, who takes care to keep the books and the coffers in his own parlour: and when at last the profits of the ferme are to be distributed, he receives, not a share, but a stipend, and discontentedly departs not with the honorable dividend of a partner, but the galling wages of a clerk.

In case of an Union, the Author thus lays down the relative circumstances of each partner, or State: Ireland, "inferior in point of Civilization, Agriculture, Commerce, Manufactures, Morals, Manners, Establishments, Constitution;" England, "Eminent and Superior in all!" Then, says he, is it not evident, "the former must be amazingly benefited by an Union? What! are we to suppose, or would he infer that England would unconditionally, gratuitously, and without most weighty corresponding sacrifices upon our part, be so *unnaturally*



*naturally* generous, as to *force* these benefits upon us? Ah!—

“ TIMEO DANAOS, ET DONA FERENTES.”

I would beseech Irishmen to pause, before they rush into the arms of such deceitful blandishment; and beware how they surrender a constitution, they never can recal!

But if I have hitherto dissented from the arguments of the pamphlet before me, how shall I express my surprize and astonishment, at the language of the 8th and 9th pages, in which the example of France—yes! of lawless, grasping, robbing France, is held up as the mirror to nations; and as the alluring example to—what? to *Indivisibility and Union!* Not to dwell upon the horror with which every honest native of England and Ireland, have been forced to look at every political act of that all-grasping and unprincipled people; not to mention the moral turpitude, nor the political infidelity of the principle, surely, if this example or parallel of our author proves any thing, it proves too much; for if England (in  
case



case of an Union) is to become like overgrown France, Ireland, (to carry on his own parallel), must be Geneva, which our author TELLS us is incorporated, and which WE KNOW is enslaved; or, she must be Savoy, which he also tells us is incorporated, and which we know has been deluged in blood; or she must be Austrian Flanders or Spain, the one convulsed with factions and intrigue, the other trembling from her vicinity to plunderers, to whose rapacity and avarice, the Pyrenees are Mole-hills; or she must be Holland, Switzerland, Sardinia, or the new Republic of Italy—take your choice. Glorious examples all of fraternal Union, and the blessings of strict political Indivisibility! I confess I am startled at this whole passage; and though I have read it often, I should doubt that I had read it aright, were it not for the very unequivocal sentences which follow: “France well knows the principle and the force of incorporations.” “Every state which she unites to herself, she makes part of her empire, ONE and INDIVISIBLE,” &c. &c. Indeed I should not have relished this implied approbation of the predatory policy of our enemy, even in a common writer: but when I find it flow from a pen, which we must suppose

suppose to have been dipped in the ink, perhaps, of the Privy-council-chamber, and guided by an official hand, I acknowledge my wonder without reserve. “*France! ONE and INDIVISIBLE!!!*” For God’s sake, if her pernicious system must be held forth at all, let it be exhibited as a warning to deter, not displayed as a model for imitation. We have lately had one kind of Union (as they called it) attempted for Ireland, and, thanks to the Providence of Almighty God, to the valour and true patriotism of the Yeomanry of Ireland, and to the prudence, vigilance, and energy of government, that wicked, bloody, and unnatural attempt, recoiled on the heads which planned it; the political blunderbuss burst in the hands which dared to present it! Again I say—let Irishmen beware of an Union!

Though the pamphlet before me, and which I am thus presuming to analyze, be entitled, “Arguments for and against an Union,” I am able (as yet) to discover no arguments, but what are enlisted (some of them actually pressed) into the service of the PRO side of this question: unless, indeed, we are to consider some of them as being veritably intended (by a very delicate irony  
of

of the author) to undermine the very cause to which common and plain-judging apprehensions, might think them applied as supporters; and truly of this class, might be supposed the argument of page 10; where the author states the loss which the secondary state or province must always and necessarily sustain, from the non-residence of only ONE branch of the legislative aggregate, namely, the Sovereign; and yet (uncandidly enough, methinks) passes over, nay, totally omits the obvious and palpable inference, *a fortiori*, of how very much these said losses must be extended, multiplied, and aggravated, (in case of such indivisible Union), when not only the king would continue an absentee, but the whole house of peers, (late residents in this kingdom), would *become* absentees, and not only king and peers be absent, but all the whole three branches of the legislature, King, Lords, Commons! ALL Absentees. I have said, the *whole* House of Peers, and I think it will not be difficult to support the supposition; for if you deduct, in the first instance, the number of elective peers, who must necessarily repair to attend parliamentary duties every session, to London, (twenty, suppose—if, indeed, England would be so good as

to

to allow us so many), if you then deduct the number of other Irish peers, who, from English political interests, English matrimonial connections, and fundry other causes, have been induced, and no doubt would continue to be additionally induced, to accept and solicit seats in the English House of Commons, I believe we shall find the catalogue of Irish resident peers, reduced to a very contracted list indeed. I suppose the number of Commoners required or allowed to Irish representation, in case of an Union, might be sixty or seventy: it must be admitted to me, that these sixty or seventy, would probably be from the most wealthy and respectable class of Irish gentry, and they also would be forced to become absentees. Then calculate the number of individuals, (the necessary satellites on each of these moving political planets), you will find, that including wives, children, tutors, servants, &c. &c. the proportion of twenty-five dependents on each member of parliament, annually EXPORTED, would be no very unreasonable supposition. Then calculate the probable amount of specie which must be transmitted annually (from rack-rents, and Lord knows what else) to London, for the maintenance of each of these eighty or ninety exported Lords and Commoners, and also for



the maintenance of each of the twenty-five dependents attendant upon the said eighty or ninety members, and you will then see the enormous drawback of rank, consequence, and property, which would (of course) take place; nay—Vanity and Fashion would still further thin this desolated metropolis, and where would be the amends? Why, in the very cheap rate at which the thousands of troops necessary (in that event) to keep this city in order, would be accommodated with barracks; our splendid Parliament House would set, perhaps, at twenty shillings PER COLUMN, per annum; and that enchanting model of architectural beauty, the envy and the admiration of strangers, would hereafter be viewed but as the sad and fullen mausoleum, in which the Irish parliament would have interred the peace, the honor, the dignity, and the independence of the LATE IRISH NATION.

But to return to your pamphlet. You lament, (page 12), that the Irish parliament is (*now*) supposed under British influence, and you allow that (even now) near one million of the rents of this kingdom are annually exported to absentees. Permit me to ask, would your proposed Union lessen or  
ameliorate



ameliorate these causes of complaint? If three hundred of the first men in this kingdom, sitting in College-green in Dublin, must be supposed under British influence, what must we conclude would be the case with sixty of those *very* persons, when transplanted to St. Stephen's chapel, in London? Good God! Sir! Are you not arguing FOR ME by anticipation, or have you mistaken the side of the water at which you should have published your arguments? To my intellects, you are forcibly proving to the English nation, how much more cheaply they *might* govern the Irish people, than they do at present. You write as an Englishman to Englishmen, I write, and speak, and FEEL as an Irishman, and I call on Irishmen to hear me!

As to the 14th page, about the Scotch and the Pretender, I can dispatch it in a trice——

TEMPORA MUTANTUR, & NOS MUTAMUR AB ILLIS.

There can be little danger upon that head now; and as to any supposed or assumed similarity between the state of Scotland, in the reign of Queen Anne, and the present circumstances of this kingdom, (vide page 15), that argument has already

been anticipated, and neatly and judiciously refuted by Mr. Spencer, in his elegant little work, "*Thoughts on a Union.*" A period of ninety-one years has not passed over the nations of Europe, without bringing in its train such advantages of every kind, and such increase of property and population, as have greatly altered the circumstances of men and things, in the two countries: Nor can I think, Sir, that you have been a jot more happy in your AMERICAN parallel, with which you proceed to fill the three or four next pages, than you were in your Sabine comparison, or your equally fortunate allusions to the Netherlands, and to the Cisalpine and Transalpine Republics. American consolidation can furnish no fair or just parallel to the case before us: Ireland and England are two separate KINGDOMS, the States of America were thirteen distinct REPUBLICS; the American Union was a federal one, the Union you propose for Ireland is, (if I understand it right) an incorporated, NOT a federal Union. Besides, no *natural* boundaries ever separated the States of America; *their* several frontiers were in all parts arbitrary and artificial, and in some, imaginary.

We

We come now to that part of the work, (page 19) in which our Author enters on a relative calculation of the quantity of property in Ireland, and the different religions of its present possessors: and states the number of Roman Catholic inhabitants of this kingdom to be, to the Protestants, in the proportion of four to one: while the property of the latter is estimated to exceed that of the former by the gross amount of ten to one. Let us examine this statement: It is a point of infinite magnitude, and I much fear that a mistaken confidence on this very subject has been one of the causes, (and perhaps not one of the least momentous) that produced those claims and troubles, which have so lately agitated Ireland. I know it has been but too frequently asserted, that the Catholics of this country are in round numbers three fourths of its inhabitants; yet I hope to PROVE, before I dismiss this position, that such a ratio neither is, or can be true.

In the year 1731, a survey of this kingdom was had, and a very accurate CENSUS of its inhabitants taken, distinguishing the relative proportion of Catholic and Protestant occupiers in each district, in each county, and finally in each province. This  
work

work was executed by order of government, published the following year, 1732; and the faith of the government of the country pledged to its veracity. The proportion of Catholics to Protestants was therein stated, and ascertained by documents which could not be refuted, to be on the scale of the whole kingdom as two and an half and a fraction to one, or in round numbers as five to two. Now if sixty seven years ago, when the power of the Pope was surely higher than at present, and when Ireland had not received the addition of the numbers of English Protestant settlers, traders and adventurers, who, with their families, have since come over amongst us; I say, if at that period, such was the proportion of the two religions, it is now fair reasoning to conclude that the excess, instead of encreasing, has been diminished. During the whole of this period, the protestant has been pretty generally the persuasion of the higher ranks of society; of course, it became so of those whom their patronage biased, or their charity supported: besides, the Catholic, until very lately, laboured under such personal disabilities, that he could not breed up his son to any of the learned professions; and the alluring prospect of glory and of rank by arms, so attractive to enthusiastic minds, was to his view closed for ever;



ever: nay, he could not acquire, at least he could not retain, and transmit to his posterity, being Catholics, ANY REAL PROPERTY. Now, I ask any man, who can keep his reason unclouded, and his opinions unprejudiced, is it presumeable, is it reasonable, or natural to conclude, that the coincidence of two such powerful principles could have continued upwards of half a century unconfesquential and inoperative? I make no account of profelyteism, or open recantations upon either side; I am writing on no religious controverfy: God forbid! I respect, I honour, and I love ALL good men of ALL persuasions: yet I will venture to hazard the assertion, that Fashion has some influence, even on religion; and that Self-interest has more: the strict Catholic persuasion was rather going out of fashion of late days, until religion became, unhappily, the handmaid of politics, and until some very deep men, some very ingenious, and some very able men contrived to make even the prejudices of the most opposite tenets, auxiliary to the schemes of private ambition and of personal aggrandizement. He has read the history of his own times with strange inaccuracy, who can be ignorant of this; and he has considered the human heart superficially indeed, who can deny it.

If



If then, it be conceded to me, that I have deduced my calculation from pure, and undeniable *facts*; I must take leave to alter your proportion of the two religions, from one fourth into two fifths; and from the same reasons I have mentioned before, I must use a similar liberty still further to reduce your assertion, that the Protestant tenures at this day, are nine tenths of the whole property of Ireland. The Irish Catholic, at this day, can acquire, can enjoy, and can transmit REAL Property. The industry, the abilities, the good fortune, and the good sense, of numbers of that persuasion, have enabled them to make large fortunes; they have seen their interests, used their ability, and purchased land. But taking the case upon your own shewing, and supposing the Protestant occupiers to hold nine tenths of all the lands in the kingdom, would it mend the matter to send many, or any of those very landlords off their own estates, to serve in a British or United Parliament; and to expend the rents and produce of those very estates, in the necessaries, the manufactures, the arts, and the luxuries, not of their own tenantry, or of their own country, but of another people in another kingdom? Would it serve to tranquillize the mind, would it conciliate the attachment of the Catholic tenant,

tenant, who now has his landlord on the spot, witness to his losses, and willing to relieve him; would it serve *him*, think you, to send a griping *Steward* to his farm, and have his last guinea eviscerated from him, to be changed, perhaps, that hour into an English Bill; not *here* to be bestowed in the relief of want, encouragement of arts, or even the consumption of luxuries; but, *there* to be eaten at a feast, drank with a mistress, or lost upon a die!!!

Sir, this is, believe me, no highly coloured picture of the effects to be expected from an Union: ONE AND INDIVISIBLE.

In the following paragraphs of your work, you represent the consequences which you say must result from the free admission of the Catholics to complete political equality, and which you state to be, Repeal of the Test and Supremacy Acts—Re-introduction of the Pope's Jurisdiction, &c. &c.: surely I shall not be expected to stop to debate such improbable events. I incline to think the prime cause necessary to their production, will never have existence. Let us not waste time upon *possible* matters, or lose sight, even for a moment of the grand question, UNION OR

NO UNION ! Would to God, we could class that attempt amongst REMOTE contingencies !

But to come, at length, to compleat argumentative precision :

In page 26 of your book, Sir, you regularly reduce and condense “ the natural effects of a favourable legislative Union,” into heads ; and you dress these heads very much in the form of axioms, “ First, secondly, thirdly, fourthly,” I shall discuss them EVERY ONE : and before I begin, shall just make one general observation ; namely, that by the expression “ favourable legislative Union,” you are “ BEGGING THE QUESTION.” What right have we to pre-suppose England would persevere in cramming “ a favourable Union” down our throats ; and insist on *loading* Ireland, her dear Sister, “  *nolens, volens,*” with Privileges, Rights, Exemptions, Immunities, and Advantages of all kinds ; which, if not taken and subtracted from her proper SELF, must drop from the moon ? Will she say to Ireland, “ Take HALF my trade, but I will keep ALL my taxes.” Thus was she “ monstrous kind,” when she ALLURED US TO A

SIMPLE

SIMPLE REPEAL, then WHEEDED US to take her absolute RENUNCIATION ; and at last COAXED us to accept of a FREE TRADE. Trust me, I should be sincerely sorry, cautious, and suspicious, were I now to see her COMPLIMENTING us with your “ favourable Union.” If ever England, by her engines, by her arts,<sup>s</sup> or by her arms, shall be able to tempt, to besot, or to provoke us to this SELF-DESTRUCTION of the vital principle of our POLITICAL EXISTENCE, if ever she shall be able to force, or to persuade us to commit upon ourselves, this great CONSTITUTIONAL SUICIDE, the only posthumous favour we can hope from the judgment of posterity, will be,——their tearful verdict—NATIONAL LUNACY !

But let me not wander from my original : you lay it down as granted, that “ the natural effects,” which would result from your “ favourable Union,” must be these :

First, “ The Empire would have but one legislature, one organ of the public will, and the dangers which arise from an *imperium in imperio*, from two supreme powers, would be avoided.” Constitutionally speaking, I hold the Lords and Commons of Ire-



land to be but parts of an “*imperium*,” and no “*Supreme power*,” without the King: their Acts are powerless without the King. The King of England is “*ipso facto*,” King of Ireland; and until it is shewn to me, that the King of Ireland is subordinate to, controulable by, or dependant upon the King of England, I cannot bring myself to think, that the legislature of Ireland, as at present established, is a “*Supreme power*,” included in, subordinate to, controulable by, and dependent upon any other “*Supreme power*” under Heaven.

At the time I sat down to answer your arguments, it was most devoutly my intention, not to desist, until I should have traced you, Sir, through all the paradoxes of your ingenious work, even to the last tittle of your last page; but, on throwing my eye over the scattered sheets, which already lie written on my table, and considering I have not yet got farther on my journey, than to your 26th page, I am apprehensive I should exceed, in point of bulk; the limits usually prescribed to pamphlets of this nature: for the present, therefore, I am constrained, indeed reluctantly, to take my leave. What I have yet further to observe upon the subject, shall make the matter of a second letter; and

as



as my heart is in the cause, you may conjecture that I shall not long continue, Sir, in your debt. In a very few days you shall hear from me again ; and, if in what I have hitherto written, an expression, or a word have escaped me, to give you personal pain or offence, I beg you to believe it very far from my intention.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your very humble, and

*No. 80, Marlborough-street,*

Obedient Servant,

*10th December, 1798.*

**PEMBERTON RUDD.**

**POSTSCRIPT.**

## POSTSCRIPT.

---

I cannot be prevailed on to let this go to the Press, without, (though it is travelling beyond the regular order I had prescribed to myself,) without giving you some short hint of my sentiments and feelings, when I read your very unkind and unmerited aspersions, on those glorious and patriotic characters, (the founders, in fact, of the Irish constitution, as the YEOMANRY since have been its Saviours,) I mean the original Volunteers of 1779 and 1782. That it may not be thought that I could mistake, mis-state, or mis-represent your true meaning, I transcribe the whole passage. It is in the 48th page of your work, where speaking on the peculiar

liar aptitude of a season, (such as this) of irritations and of turbulence, as best suited to the introduction of constitutional innovations, because readiest offering the means to rivet them upon us; you deliver your opinion in these explicit and *extraordinary* terms:—

“ As to a time of war, it is true, that the Volunteers took advantage of the embarrassments of Great Britain, in the last war, to assert the independence of our parliament. It is likewise true, that the United Irishmen, in the present war, have taken advantage of the supposed weakness of Great Britain, to play the game of separation. When, therefore, enemies of the Empire take advantage of a time of war and embarrassment, to effect its ruin, we should turn against them their own game, and make use of a time of war to establish its security.”

Here is a proposition most logically constructed with two premises and a conclusion. Premises how incongruous! how monstrous the conclusion! The original Volunteers of Ireland are here made to correspond and agree, and are put in most pointed

pointed apposition to the horde of convicted, or confessed traitors, the United Irishmen of 1798: their actions are described in terms as injurious as any Johnson or Sheridan could furnish; “to take advantage,” is appropriate to swindlers and robbers; “to assert,” as it is here used, infers unjust assumption, and insinuates unfounded claim. The second sentence, designates the United Irishmen by precisely the same expression bestowed upon the Volunteers. “*The United Irishmen in the present war—the Volunteers in the last war*”—both have taken advantage. It is an unlucky phrase; and little mended by occurring yet a third time in the conclusion. “*When, therefore, enemies of the empire take advantage,*” &c. Enemies of the empire! Who? What enemies? And of what empire? Is it the original Volunteers of Ireland, enemies! Is it those very men to whom you yourself, then an Officer of the House of Commons, did in the Session of 1782, transmit, TRANSCRIBE, the unanimous thanks of the Parliament of Ireland, for being the steady Friends and Soldiers of their country—The glorious founders of our Independency and Constitution! Are these  
the



the enemies you mean? Are these the men you now say were "*effecting the ruin*" of their country? Are these the "*gamesters,*" against whom you propose "*we should turn*" and unite? Who is meant by WE? Who *can* be meant? Not the United Irishmen: they are also players of the same game you say: not the corporate bodies of Ireland: not the Houses of Parliament of Ireland: they have all recorded their sentiments, their approbation, and their thanks: not the Merchants of Ireland, they enjoy that very "*Free Trade*" the Volunteers procured them: not the Lawyers of Ireland, they know their constitution, and they love it; and when they entered the profession, Sir, they swore to KEEP it; not the Yeomanry of Ireland, they armed to protect, secure, and improve, what the Volunteers armed to assert, establish, and maintain. There is not then, (and I am proud to say it!) there is not then in ALL Ireland, one single rank, class, or description of men, to whom your *patriotic* exhortation is, or can be applicable. As you have chosen *English* arguments, you must select an *English* audience, and you are SURE of pleasing. As to us, leave us, for God's sake, as you found us. We have been in a fever, the crisis is past, and we are

E

mending;

mending; do not *bleed* or *physic* us into a *consumption*, and all may be well yet. Our *Constitution* is not *so* bad as *you* would make it.

In my next, (for positively I am just concluding,) you shall have the thoughts of an unambitious man, upon that part of your pamphlet, in which you exult, not a little, at the wholesome curb and restrictive effect of an Union; in detaching young barristers from political pursuits: chaining them like *clerks* and *scriveners* to their desks, and putting an effectual stop to those *impudent* strides by which they are so apt to *thrust* themselves into the House of Commons: not forgetting to suggest to you one trifling omission which you made in your catalogue of advantages, that are to accrue to suitors, after an Union, in having their causes argued and managed by lawyers, who will, *then*, no longer have their brains bewildered with political speculations: but you strangely forgot to mention the great additional advantage which the said suitors must derive from the RE-TRANSPORTATION of the APPELLANT JURISDICTION: whereby they will have their causes *finally* decided on, in a much shorter, quicker, easier, and less expensive manner,

no doubt, at the Bar of the British House of Lords, than they could possibly have at home here in the capital of their own county: Not to mention its being a foolish, gaudy feather in the cap of the Irish Constitution, with which we dressed ourselves so giddily in 1781. I think I remember an illumination when the Appellant Jurisdiction was brought home to us: it will be perfectly in character to illuminate again, when it shall be taken away, away for EVER, by the consummation of an Irish Union, one and indivisible!

P. R.

FINIS.

